

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

Sr. No.158

CWP No.12664 of 2022

Date of Decision: 01.06.2022

Sh. Satpal Kalsi

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Ms. Gitanjali Chhabra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that in the present case, the petitioner, who was working as Technician Grade-II with Department of Printing and Stationery, Punjab, Sector 18, Chandigarh, was not granted annual increment even though he had served for a period of one year prior to the retirement, i.e. w.e.f. 01.09.2010 to 31.08.2011, hence the benefit of said increment has not been given and the same was not added in pay of the petitioner for computing his pensionary benefits. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the question of law as raised in the present petition has already been decided by this Court while passing judgment in **CWP-32598-2019**, titled as **“Gurdev Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another”**, decided on 16.03.2022.

Mr. Navdeep Chhabra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, keeping in view the advance service of the copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that though the question of law, as raised in the present petition, has already been decided by this Court in **Gurdev Singh's case (supra)**, but whether the petitioner has served for a

period of one year, i.e. w.e.f. 01.09.2010 to 31.08.2011, or not with the respondent-Department is a factual aspect which cannot be replied to at this stage, and therefore, the present petition be disposed of in terms of the order passed by this Court in **Gurdev Singh's case (supra)**, but with a liberty to the respondents that if the petitioner has not rendered one year regular service with the respondent-Department, as contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, an appropriate order will be passed by the authorities concerned.

Learned counsel for the petitioner raises no objection for grant of the said liberty to the respondents.

Keeping in view the above, the present petition is disposed of in terms of the order passed in **Gurdev Singh's case (supra)** with liberty to the respondents that in case it is found that the petitioner has not worked for a period of one year with the respondent-Department, as being claimed in the present petition, an appropriate order on the said aspect be passed by the authorities concerned, within a period of eight weeks of passing of this order, otherwise the benefit for which the petitioner is entitled for, be released in his favour.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

01.06.2022
Maninder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No